

10/25/66

Dear Jack,

Thanks for your constructive letter of several dates. I can now but acknowledge it for this has been a long day of letter-writing and package-wrapping in which I've not been able to write or read anything and have not yet finished.

To answer those of your letters for which there is time: I believe I was the first to use the phrase "The False Oswald". Whether anyone else earlier detected this person or persons I do not know. I was unaware of it if anyone preceeded me. I certainly had read nothing in any book or magazine until very long after I wrote this, in fact, until I saw the Hopkin transparency.

I fear your questions, too, are rhetorical. I must confess disappointment that the press has had so little interest, but gratification that so many people did.

I do not regard Dr. McClelland's statement as accidental or in error. What it lacks is the fault of the questioners. It is conspicuous no questions were asked about this and that the doctor declined to withdraw anything he had written. Of course, there are and will be many questions about the wounds and the autopsy, but again, only because of deficiencies in the investigation.

It is not necessary to assume that there was a great big conspiract to misinform the people. For many of those involved, befuddlement of truth is not an exceptional experience. For other, taking orders is an unquestioned thing. For all it is not necessarily evil intentions, from their points of view. It is terrible, perhaps more terrible because of this. Once the President was dead and the alleged assassin dead, this was the easiest out and there was not the requisite courage to look hard for any others. This may not be the case, but it is, I think, a possibility.

There is so much that I know that I do not want to believe, so much that I fear misinterpreting (possibly it would be more precise to say shun interpreting). Regardless of what or how much I know or think I know, it is without doubt true that there is much I do not. I think it best to suspend such final judgements until we know what it is possible to know.

On the mortality rate among witnesses, Penn Jones, Jr. ("Forgive My Grief", his own private printing, done at his newspaper, The Midlothian (Texas) Mirror) is the best authority. He is now in the east making appearances on behalf of Ramparts, which in the current issue used much of his material, without crediting his book. Its price is \$2.95. Perhaps later I can get you a copy. He may appear on the Jack McKinney Show. I've tried to facilitate this. By now the list is too long to give you with finality. About a dozen have died, Penn saying perhaps a dozen and a half.

There are some parts of Phila where Ch. 5 is seen, especially with special effects. None of my Phila. family can get it. I hope in the future to be able to get a sound tape of it. My tape of the Burke show is on the west coast. I expect it back soon. Sometime when I can I'll inquire into the making of duplicates. My machine is capable of 1 7/8 and 3 3/4 speeds only. I generally record speech at 1 7/8 for economy. Thus six hours can get on both sides of a single 5" reel of 1/2 mil mylar. For the moment I've told you all I can of the sequel.. If McKinney invites me again (the last was by phone and entirely unanticipated on both sides) I'll let you know. I have challenged Judge Fein to debate me on his review or my book there. If this is accepted and I know in advance, I'd actually like you to be there if possible for by now, with the long time lapse since I wrote the book and all the other material I've handled since then I expect you can find things in it faster than I can.

I was not intending to evade. I believe there is no doubt of Cuban refugee involvement. I think it probably they were not alone and not without other

connections....Epstein never addressed himself to the question of the evidence against Oswald. He took the acceptable if unscholarly course of assuming it. This, of course, helped get his book published.. I think history will record a low opinion of him and his book, attributing to it the essential function of being the weak first one that could be commercially printed. What little else he has is but an enlargement of my introduction, in an unfair and immature context.

For your present thinking of Oswald, regardless of who he was or might have been, what not assume, as our law does, that he is innocent until proven guilty? This has not yet happened and I think never will happen.

Thanks